

### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully considered the Office Action of October 20, 2005 and offers the following remarks to accompany the above amendments.

Applicant herein amends claims 1, 14, and 27 to include the subject matter of claim 4. Claim 4 is canceled as redundant. Claims 19-26 are canceled to simplify issues. Applicant reserves the right to reintroduce the subject matter contained therein at a later date.

Claims 1, 14, 19, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for not being enabled. Applicant cancels claim 19 rendering this rejection moot. Applicant amends claims 1, 14, and 27 to delete the boot language which the Patent Office asserts is not enabled. While Applicant disagrees with the Patent Office's conclusion on this issue, Applicant does not need this language for patentability, so the language is deleted to simplify issues.

Claims 1-11 and 13-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Levine in view of Shih et al. Applicant respectfully traverses. For the Patent Office to establish *prima facie* obviousness, the Patent Office must show where each and every claim element is taught. MPEP § 2143.03.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 14, and 27 to include the subject matter of claim 4. The Patent Office admits that Levine does not disclose a system that performs cleanup functions, but asserts that Shih, col. 8, line 35 to col. 9, line 53 teaches the element. While the passage does discuss cleanup functions, the passage does not discuss removing browsing histories, cookies, preferences, and bookmarks as recited in the claim. Rather, Shih teaches removing registry entries, icons from the task bar, and the like (see Shih, col. 7, lines 64-67 and col. 9, lines 40-45). The removal of registry entries and icons is not the same thing as what is recited in the claim. Thus, the references individually do not teach or suggest the claim element. Since the references individually do not teach or suggest the claim element, the combination of references cannot teach or suggest the claim element. Since the combination does not teach or suggest the claim element, the combination does not establish obviousness and the claims are allowable. Applicant requests withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 1-11, 13-18, and 27-32 at this time.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Levine and Shih and further in view of Scan Tech News article. Applicant respectfully traverses. The standard for establishing obviousness is set forth above.

As explained above, the combination of Levine and Shih does not show the element from claim 4. The addition of the Scan Tech News article does not cure the deficiencies of the original combination. Thus, the combination of references does not teach or suggest the claim element. Since the combination does not teach or suggest the claim element, the combination does not establish obviousness, and claim 12 is allowable.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection in light of the amendments and remarks presented herein. Applicant earnestly solicits claim allowance at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By: 

Benjamin S. Withrow

Registration No. 40,876

P.O. Box 1287

Cary, NC 27512

Telephone: (919) 654-4520

Date: January 18, 2006  
Attorney Docket: 4989-008

<p align="center"><b>CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION</b></p> <p>I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING TRANSMITTED VIA FACSIMILE ON THE DATE INDICATED BELOW TO:</p> <p>Examiner: <u>Klimach, Paula W.</u> Art Unit: <u>2135</u> Fax: <u>571-273-8300</u></p> <p><u>Michelle Heymann</u> Name of Sender</p> <p><u>Michelle Heymann</u> Signature</p> <p><u>1-18-06</u> Date of Transmission</p>
---